

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2150

CHARLES T. SHERWIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

PAT PINER; HAROLD MAYNARD; SUSAN BRIGGS;
STEPHEN KUSHNER; KIMBERLY LEDFORD; GEORGE
GLENN, II; STEVEN GHEEN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard,
District Judge. (CA-03-275-5-H)

Submitted: February 25, 2004

Decided: April 7, 2004

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles T. Sherwin, Appellant Pro Se. Zebulon Dyer Anderson,
SMITH, ANDERSON, BLOUNT, DORSETT, MITCHELL & JERNIGAN, Raleigh,
North Carolina; John Francis Morris, MORRIS, YORK, WILLIAMS, SURLES
& BARRINGER, L.L.P., Charlotte, North Carolina; Joseph C. Moore,
III, ALLEN & MOORE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Thomas Giles Meacham,
Jr., William McBlief, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH
CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina; Myra Leake Griffin, NORTH
CAROLINA INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Charles T. Sherwin appeals the district court's orders dismissing under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint and denying his motion to alter or amend the judgment. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error and no abuse of discretion. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court, see Sherwin v. Piner, No. CA-03-275-5-H (E.D.N.C. filed July 21, 2003; entered July 22, 2003 & filed Aug. 11, 2003; entered Aug. 12, 2003), and we deny Sherwin's motion for remand. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED